UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,143	04/25/2000	Jeff A. Zimniewicz	203991	9311

23460 7590 06/24/2004

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER	
STEELMAN, MARY J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	15

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/557,143	ZIMNIEWICZ, JEFF A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mary J. Steelman	2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 April 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Amendment B, received 5 April 2004. Per Applicant's request, claim 11 has been amended. Claims 1-15 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. In view of the amendment to Claim 11, the claim objection in the prior office action is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,259,447 to Kanetake et al.

Per claim 1:

-A method. (Col. 1, lines 6-8, "This invention relates to an information processing method..."

-providing a text based setup data file having at least one section containing a display order textual listing of the UI screens;

(See figure 8, #801, Screen ID, #871, Previous Screen, and #873, Next Screen. Also, col. 3, lines 20-21, "...an operation is capable of recording screen specifying data..." Col. 17, line 63–col. 18, line 25, "...register information (text based setup data file) for monitoring/controlling automatic execution (display order) into the screen/procedure registration library...record screen

specifying information (e.g., a screen number...) for each screen appearing in an application...normal processing, three different types of data...is registered into the system...exceptional screen...two different types of data ...is registered...special procedure in preparation for appearance of an unexpected screen...input variable data is registered into the system...")

-providing a text editor and editing the display order textual listing of the UI screens in the setup data file using the text editor.

(Col. 19, lines 55-58, "These normal processing screen/procedure data, exceptional processing screen/procedure data, and special processing procedure data may be manually modified by a text editor..." (providing a text editor))

Per claim 2:

-display order textual listing includes a plurality of individual UI screen identifiers.

(Col. 20, lines 24-27, "The screen identifier is provided for enabling understanding of registration content when an operator carries out a registration work or modifies a registered content.")

-said step of editing comprises the step of deleting at least one of the plurality of individual UI screen identifiers.

(Col. 19, lines 55-58, "These normal processing screen/procedure data, exceptional processing screen/procedure data, and special processing procedure data may be manually modified by a text editor...")

Per claims 3-5:

-display order textual listing includes a plurality of individual UI screen identifiers listed in a first order.

(See fig. 7, #701 & #801. Screen number, screen identifier.)

-said step of editing comprises the step of reordering the individual UI screen identifiers to a second order / step of adding a new UI screen identifier / step replacing the plurality of individual UI screen identifiers with a new textual listing of screen identifiers.

(Modifications (reordering / adding / replacing) are made through the registration process. Col. 19, lines 46-58, "FIG. 4 is a conceptual diagram showing the exceptional processing screen/procedure data 250. Like the normal processing screen/procedure data 210 of FIG. 3, this data 250 manages information of screen specifying data 260 and input variable data 270 for each service ID and for each sequence number (SEQ) 253 of screens to be outputted. Registration content of its screen specifying data is the same as that of the normal processing screen/procedure data 210..." (data manages sequence number))

Per claims 6 & 7:

-providing a dynamic link library (dll) / executable (EXE) file defining a UI screen, and wherein said step of editing comprises the step of inserting a textual reference to the dll in the display order textual listing.

(Fig. 2, #130, Screen / Procedure Registration Library. Also, col. 17, lines 65-67, "...it is necessary...to register information for monitoring/controlling automatic execution into the screen/procedure registration library." Also, col. 24, lines 60-65, "...normal screen specifying

data "i" is extracted from the screen/procedure registration library, and this is compared...If they do not match, a exception screen processing routine...is executed." A registration library holds procedures (dlls / execution files). A normal routine may be processed or an exception routine may be processed.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8 - 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,259,447 to Kanetake et al., and further in view of US Patent 6,360,365 to Curtis.

Per claim 8:

Kanetake disclosed , (Abstract, lines 6), "For each screen appearing in an application to be automatically executed, information for spacifying the screen (e.g., a screen number...) is recorded...to confirm that the automatic execution is being carried out in accordance with a predetermined procedure." Kanetake disclosed a UI screen template feature (figs. 2-5) for use when encountering normal, exceptional, or special processing. A screen number is specified (fig. 7 & col. 20, lines 21-38) during the "template" registration process. Col. 3, lines 24-26, "...information processing that is executed based on a plurality of normal processing screen

specifying data items that are stored in an ordered sequence (display order textual listing)..." Kanetake failed to disclose a suite installation program.

However, Curtis disclosed, (col. 3, lines 55-59), "...at least one file set including install objects to install a computer program is provided...The install objects are processed to install the computer program..." Also, col. 5, lines 28-45, "A script...is used to run the install engine. Within the script there are the following...a state machine. Within the state machine, there are various state such as a welcome state, a destination state, a copy state...the state machine is executed...Within any given state there are several objects. There are ...GUI panels..."

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified Kanetake's invention to sequence desired screens, by including the sequenced GUI panels required for a suite installation, as disclosed by Curtis because a suite installation is merely a limited example of one of Kanetake's automatically executing applications. Both inventions are directed towards making better use of existing applications on rapidly changing operational environments (Kanetake, col. 1, line 15.)

Per claim 9:

Kanetake disclosed, a "text based setup database" file to handle Normal, Exceptional or Special situations (figs. 3-6). Kanetake disclosed, "The database file including a display order textual" (col. 17, lines 65-67, "...register information for monitoring/controlling automatic execution into the screen/procedure registration library(database file including a display order)"). Kanetake disclosed "specific user interface screens to be displayed during installation", (col. 23, lines 3-6, "...if no exceptional screen appears, and screens "A1 to AN" registered as normal

processing successively appear, input variable data registered (specific screens) as normal processing is sequentially sent toward the host machine...") Kanetake failed to disclose a suite installation program. Kanetake disclosed a computer-readable medium (col. 3, lines 17-22), "...there is provided software for recording an operational procedure...an operation is capable of recording screen specifying data, input variable data and output variable data..." Also see col. 29, lines 38-col. 30, line 24 and col. 31, line12-col. 8, line28.

However, Curtis disclosed "plurality of components bundled in a suite" (col. 3, lines 55-60), "...at least one file set including install objects to install a computer program..."

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified Kanetake's invention to send specific sequenced screens, to include the feature of a suite installation, as disclosed by Curtis because a suite installation is merely a limited example of one of Kanetake's automatically executing applications.

Per claims 10 & 11:

-at least one dynamic link library (dll) / executable (EXE) file defining a UI screen, and wherein said display order textual listing contains a textual reference to said dll.

(Fig. 2, #130, Screen / Procedure Registration Library. Also, col. 17, lines 65-67, "...it is necessary...to register information for monitoring/controlling automatic execution into the screen/procedure registration library." Also, col. 24, lines 60-65, "...normal screen specifying data "i" is extracted from the screen/procedure registration library, and this is compared...If they do not match, a exception screen processing routine...is executed." A registration library holds

procedures (dlls / execution files). A normal routine may be processed or an exception routine may be processed.)

Per claim 12:

-acquiring a textual listing of user interface screens for each of a plurality of applications in a suite that are to be installed;

(Kanetake required registration of data for normal, exceptional or special processing. Col. 18, lines 31-35, "...the normal processing screen/procedure data manages screen specifying data...for each service ID and for each sequence number...of screen to be outputted...The screen specifying data has information for specifying a screen.")

-acquiring the user interface screens identified by the textual listing;

(Col. 19, lines 55-58, "These normal processing screen/procedure data, exceptional processing screen/procedure data, and special processing procedure data may be manually modified (acquired) by a text editor...")

-displaying the user interface screen identified by the textual listing for each of the application in the suite that are to be installed.

(Col. 23, lines 3-4, "...screens...registered (identified)...successively appear (displaying)...")

Kanetake required registration of data for normal, exceptional or special processing. Col. 18, lines 31-35, "...the normal processing screen/procedure data manages screen specifying data...for each service ID and for each sequence number...of screen to be outputted...The screen specifying data has information for specifying a screen." Col. 23, lines 2-6, "...if no exceptional screen appears, and screens "A1" to "AN" registered as normal processing successively appear,

input variable data registered as normal processing is sequentially sent toward the host machine..." Kanetake disclosed a computer-readable medium (col. 3, lines 17-22), "...there is provided software for recording an operational procedure...an operation is capable of recording screen specifying data, input variable data and output variable data..." Also see col. 29, lines 38-col. 30, line 24 and col. 31, line12-col. 8, line28.

Kanetake failed to disclose a suite installation using ordered GUI screens. However, Curtis disclosed a suite installation, using stored display information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify Kanetake's invention to include an ordered GUI suite installation because it is merely a more specific application that that disclosed by Kanetake.

Per claim 13:

-step of acquiring the user interface screens comprises the step of acquiring user interface screen templates provided by an installation application.

(See figs. 3, 4, 5, and 6 regarding Normal, Exceptional and Special (template) processing for GUI applications. Col. 24, line 59- col. 25, line 6, "Then, using a value of the service ID received from the client machine and a value of "i", normal screen specifying data "i" is extracted from the screen/procedure registration library, and this is compared with the screen data received from the terminal emulator. If they do not match, an exception screen processing routine is executed. If they match...Next an input variable "i" is sent toward the host machine comparison/determination means..." Also, col. 25, line 19, "...exceptional screen processing routine...executed when...the normal screen specifying data "i" does not match...special

processing routine is executed..." A comparison is done to choose the correct screen to display from the Normal, Exceptional or Special template selection.)

Per claims 14 & 15:

-step of acquiring the user interface screens comprises the step of acquiring at least one user interface screen dynamic link library defining at least one user interface screen.

(Fig. 2, #130, Screen / Procedure Registration Library. Also, col. 17, lines 65-67, "...it is necessary...to register information for monitoring/controlling automatic execution into the screen/procedure registration library (dynamic link library)." Also, col. 24, lines 60-65, "...normal screen specifying data "i" is extracted from the screen/procedure registration library, and this is compared...If they do not match, a exception screen processing routine...is executed." A registration library holds procedures (dlls / execution files). A normal routine may be processed or an exception routine may be processed. The registration defines the interface screens.)

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 5 April 2004, in Amendment B have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant has argued, in substance, the following:

As Applicant has noted on page 5, 5th paragraph, of Amendment B, Kanetake "does not provide any access to, nor ability to edit a display order textual listing of this ordered sequence of display screens."

Examiner's Response:

While Kanetake is not using the same words as those found in the claims, he has disclosed the same actions. Col. 18, lines 26-30, "FIGS 3 to 5 are conceptual diagrams showing normal processing screen/procedure data 210, exceptional processing screen/procedure data 250, and special processing procedure data 280 respectively, each being registered into the screen/procedure registration library." (text based setup data file) See Col. 19, lines 46-58, "FIG. 4 is a conceptual diagram showing the exceptional processing screen/procedure data 250. Like the normal processing screen/procedure data 210 of FIG. 3, this data 250 manages information of screen specifying data 260 and input variable data 270 for each service ID and for each sequence number (SEQ) 253 of screens to be outputted. Registration content of its screen specifying data is the same as that of the normal processing screen/procedure data 210..." (data manages sequence number) "FIG. 5 is a conceptual diagram showing the special processing procedure data 280..." Col. 19, lines 55-58, "These normal processing screen/procedure data 210, exceptional processing screen/procedure data 250, and special processing procedure 280 **may be manually modified by a text editor** or the like." (emphasis added) Editing the data has the effect of editing the display order textual listing of the screens.

(B) Applicant has argued, in substance, the following:

As Applicant has noted on page 6, 1st paragraph, of Amendment B, "This sequential incrementing of the variable i clearly demonstrates that no text based setup data file exists." "No setup data file is referenced to determine which screen should be displayed."

Examiner's Response:

Examiner disagrees that incrementing variable i demonstrates that no text based setup data file exists. The references to the i variable (cols. 3-13) provide determination means as to whether a 'normal' screen or an 'exceptional' screen (or interruption processing screen specifying data item) will be sent to an application (col. 3, line 36-37) "causing the same to generate a screen data item". Kanetake disclosed that sequential information is "registered into the system". Col. 18, line 1- col. 22, line 62 provides details on the registration. Col. 18, lines 4-8, "it is necessary to record screen specifying information (e.g., a screen number...) for each screen appearing in an application to be automatically executed..." Col. 18, lines 36-37, "The screen specifying data has information for specifying a screen." Thus, the registration acts like a setup data file.

(C) Applicant has argued, in substance, the following:

As Applicant has noted on page 7, 3rd paragraph, of Amendment B, the combination of Kanetake and Curtis is not obvious, lacks motivation to combine

Examiner's Response:

The Kanetake reference discloses the registration of sequence order for screens in a textual format, which can be edited. Col. 19, lines 55-58, "These normal processing screen/procedure

data 210, exceptional processing screen/procedure data 250, and special processing procedure 280 **may be manually modified by a text editor** or the like." (emphasis added) Editing the data has the effect of editing the display order textual listing of the screens. Curtis provided references to suite installations and managing displays. Col. 2, lines 19-21, "invention relates to a method, system, and program for managing and preserving background display settings during install..." Col. 2, lines 23-27, "An installer program is a software program that enables a programmer to write specific code to install a given application program onto the drives of a computer in a way that enables the given application program to work correctly with the computer's environment..." Kanetake's invention relates to a correct screen appearing (triggered by a normal event or an exceptional event). Kanetake allows for text editing of the registration files, which hold information, related to the sequence of screens. Kanetake noted (col. 1, lines 15-16), "...operational environments are rapidly changing..." and lines 60-62, "an automatic execution program that is capable of handling an exceptional processing procedure by a client without changing a host application" makes the use of existing applications more manageable. Thus both inventions are related to making existing applications manageable as computer environments evolve, and thus the combination is obvious.

Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 1-15.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

An additional search provided the following related patents:

US Patent 6,407,758 B1 to Usami et al. (A screen editor provides display control.)

US Patent 5,675,752 to Scott et al. (Interactive presentation editor.)

US Patent 6,006,035 to Nabahi (Method and system for custom computer software installation, custom installation parameters in a script language file. The rule-based instruction file is modified to cause the rule-based installation engine to execute commands in the compiled script language file.)

US Patent 6,618,857 B1 to Zimniewicz et al. (Method and system for installation of a suite. Setup program may modify the baseline installation image.)

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Steelman, whose telephone number is (703) 305-4564. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday, from 7:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552.

The fax phone number is (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Mary Steelman

06/03/2004

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER